REMARKS

After entry of this Request for Reconsideration, claims 1 - 15 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated February 1, 2005, Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Aucktor et al. Claim 1 recites that each helical groove is disposed in mirrored rotational relation with a corresponding helical groove disposed on an opposite side of the longitudinal axis of the inner joint member. The meaning of "mirrored rotational relation" is set forth in paragraphs [0020] and [0021]:

> "For convenience, the groove 16a can be characterized as a right-hand groove. The groove 16e extends between the first and second ends 24, 26 in mirrored relation to the groove 16a and, for convenience, can also be referred to as a right-hand groove."
> Paragraph [0020]

> "For convenience, the groove 16c can be referred to as a left-hand groove. The groove 16g extends in mirrored relation to the groove 16c and, for convenience, can also be referred to as a left-hand groove." Paragraph [0021]

Figure 5 of Aucktor et al. has been cited as showing helical grooves disposed in mirrored rotational relation about a longitudinal axis. It is submitted that the grooves 5b and 5a are not disposed in mirrored rotational relation about the axis 9. Grooves 5a and 5b extend in opposite rotational relation with respect to one another and not in mirrored rotational relation. In other words, one of the grooves 5a and 5b must be characterized as a right-hand groove and the other must be characterized as a left-hand groove. The applicants have provided a clear definition of "mirrored rotational relation" in the specification; the term referring to the fact that both of the referred-to grooves extend in the same rotational direction, either right-hand or left-hand.

Claims 3, 9 and 11 – 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aucktor et al. in view of Schwarzler, U.S. Pat. No. 5,685,777. As set forth above, Aucktor et al. fails to teach or suggest helical grooves disposed in mirrored rotational relation about a longitudinal axis and Schwarzler does not overcome this deficiency. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 3, 9 and 11 which depend from claim 1 define over the art and are in suitable condition for allowance. Claim 12 also recites helical grooves disposed in mirrored

rotational relation about a longitudinal axis and therefore also defines over the art. Claims 13 – 15 depend from claim 12 and are therefore also in suitable condition for allowance.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Further and favorable action is requested. If additional fees are incurred because of this Request for Reconsideration and not included, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said additional fees, as well as credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 08-2789 of Howard & Howard Attorneys, P.C.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS

March 29, 2005

Raymond C. Meiers, Registration No. 51,081
Howard and Howard Attorneys, P.C.
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite 101
39400 Woodward Ave.
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5151
(248) 723-0417

<div style="border:1px solid black;">

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.6 AND 1.8

I hereby certify that this **AMENDMENT and INTERVIEW SUMMARY** is faxed to Examiner Aaron Dunwoody, Art Group 3679, at Facsimile Number (703) 872-9306, on **March 29, 2005.**

Karri Chamberlin
Karri Chamberlin

</div>

Attorney Reference No: DP-309838
Application Serial No.: 10/730,309

7

PAGE 10/10 * RCVD AT 3/29/2005 4:27:34 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/5 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:2486451568 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-30